

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and the following remarks are presented for the Examiner's consideration.

Reconsideration of the subject patent application in view of the present remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the applicants' admitted prior art (hereinafter "AAPA" – paragraphs [0002]-[0005] of specification and "Prior Art" Figure 5) in view of JP 8-155881 (hereinafter "Nakano"). For at least the following reasons, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

The assertion in the Office action that Nakano (page 3) discloses the limitation that "the connecting cable and/or the gas hose are guided through the hollow portion of the rotary pipe shaft from the wire feed device on the forearm portion" is flawed because a guide tube 22 of Nakano is not "a rotary shaft for holding the wire feed device" as recited in claim 1. This rejection fails because no reference discloses guiding the connecting cable and/or the gas hose through the hollow portion of the rotary pipe shaft for holding the wire feed device.

Although AAPA discloses a rotary shaft (page 2, line 14) for holding a wire feed device, it does not disclose a rotary pipe shaft. Moreover, neither AAPA nor Nakano discloses, teaches, or suggests a rotary pipe shaft as recited in claim 1 or guiding the connecting cable and/or the gas hose through the hollow portion of the rotary pipe shaft. Nakano discloses guiding a cable 10 through a base 1, a revolution section 2, a first arm 4 and a second arm 5 to tools for processing 7. The guide tube 22 of the revolution section 2 is not a rotary pipe shaft because it does not hold a wire feed device as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, although the Office action equates guide tube 22 of Nakano with a rotary pipe shaft of claim 1, cable 10 does not pass through guide tube 22. Meanwhile, tool hoses 8 do not pass through the inside of the first arm 4 after passing through guide tube 22. Therefore, the limitation that “the connecting cable and/or the gas hose are guided through the hollow portion of the rotary pipe shaft from the wire feed device and are then guided through an inside of the forearm portion, the upper arm portion, the swing portion, and the base portion of the robot main body” is not disclosed by Nakano.

Furthermore, since Nakano does not contemplate guiding the cable 10 to a wire feed device, a combination of AAPA and Nakano will not result in the claimed invention. The logical result of modifying AAPA by Nakano is an arc welding robot in which the rear portion 107 of the conduit cable is guided through the robot main body 101 and in which the connecting cable/gas hose 109 is routed from the base portion 101a to the wrist portion 101e. Therefore, the combination of prior art references does not teach or suggest each and every claim limitation and, as a result, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made. Thus, the Examiner’s rejection must be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. NGB-39700.

Appln. No. 10/567,977
Response dated December 14, 2007
Reply to final Office action dated September 20, 2007

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON, LLP

By: /Seongyoune Kang/ SK
Seongyoune Kang – Reg. No. L0391

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: December 14, 2007